DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 158 95 EA 010 981

TITLE	Teacher Evaluation. The Best of ERIC, Number 40.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 78
CONTRACT	400-78-0007
NOTE	5p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; Effective Teaching; Elementary Secondary Education; Observation; Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The ten items in this annotated bibliography are articles and documents in the ERIC system concerning evaluation of teachers. Research surveys cited focus on the present state of teacher evaluation, the use of observation reports, how often teachers desire to be evaluated, and principals' ideas of teacher effectiveness. Other topics covered are teacher self-observation systems, colleague evaluation, setting mutually agreed on goals, evaluation of beginning teachers, evaluation procedures in teacher contracts, and evaluation instruments. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Number 40 November 1978

The Best of ERIC

Clearinghouse on Educational Management

The Best of ERIC presents annotations of ERIC literature on important topics in educational management.

The selections are intended to give the practicing educator easy access to the most significant and useful information available from ERIC. Because of space limitations, the items listed should be viewed as representative, rather than exhaustive, of literature meeting those criteria.

Materials were selected for inclusion from the ERIC catalogs ***Resources in Education (RIE)*** and ***Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE).***

This bibliography was prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management for distribution by the American Association of School Administrators, the Association of California School Administrators, and the Association of Wisconsin School Administrators.

Teacher Evaluation

ED161158

1 **Bushman, John H.** "Are Teachers Playing 'Statue' in the Classroom?" *NASSP Bulletin,* 58, 386 (December 1974), pp. 25-37. EJ 106 950.

Bushman outlines three teacher self-observation systems in which teachers "receive objective feedback" concerning their classroom behaviors and then "appraise their own teaching effectiveness" using this feedback. Bushman emphasizes that these systems "*must* be thought of as tools for the teacher to use in *self-appraisal* rather than for the administrator to use in evaluation." The administrator's role should be that of "instigator and resource person rather than director or teacher" of these systems.

The first system Bushman describes is the Teacher Self-Appraisal Observation System (TSA). The TSA defines thirty-one behavior categories under the subheadings methods, objectives, and verbal and nonverbal expressions. Before a lesson, the teacher "establishes a lesson plan using the TSA categories," indicating "the percentage of time he plans to spend in each category." Then the teacher is videotaped teaching the lesson. Afterward, the teacher codes the lesson by stopping the recorder at ten-second intervals to tally his methods, expressions, and achievement of objectives on a TSA coding card.

The Flanders Interaction Analysis is used by a teacher to determine the extent to which "he is or is not an authority figure." Using a ten-category scheme, the type and extent of verbal initiation and response behaviors in the classroom are marked on a scorecard. Another person can do the marking, or the teacher can evaluate himself if recording equipment is available.

The third system is the Teacher Image Questionnaire, in which students are asked to rate a teacher in sixteen areas such as knowledge of subject, fairness, and teaching procedures. To participate, a teacher requests the service from the Educator Feedback Center at Western Michigan University. The questionnaire is given to the class, usually by the principal, who then returns the material to the center. The center makes an image profile and returns it to the teacher only.

Bushman includes definitions of each of the TSA and Flanders systems categories, as well as a sample TSA scoring card.

EA 010 981

2 **Drummond, William H.** "Involving the Teacher in Evaluation." *National Elementary Principal,* 52, 5 (February 1973), pp. 30-32. EJ 077 209.

"Systemwide evaluation should be focused on school-by-school achievement," states Drummond, while "the evaluation of individual certificated teachers should be done only by colleagues in the [same] building—with records kept only in the building." This approach allows schools to be more responsive to the specific needs of their clientele (parents and students), while creating an atmosphere more conducive to improving education.

To institute this kind of evaluation system, Drummond suggests that principals first "request the central office and the school board to excuse your building from the regular teacher evaluation procedures this year," and then "with the faculty, parents and older students, develop a strategy for school improvement."

A training program in observation techniques should be established for teachers and administrators. Evaluations should be organized on a "helping trio" basis, with a helper, a helpee, and a mutually agreed on observer. The helper practices "real helping skills: listening, paraphrasing, empathizing, providing psychological support," and so forth. The observer "periodically provides feedback to both on the clarity and directness of communications."

Each teacher and administrator should keep a record of what he or she does during the year. At the end of the year, the principal should give the central office "detailed, nonpunitive information about the work of the school and its faculty." These kinds of changes, contends Drummond, allow teacher evaluation to become a positive force in school improvement.

3 **Hall, George L., Jr.** *Assessing Staff Effectiveness: Practical Approaches to Meaningful Evaluation.* 1974. 12 pages. ED 097 338.

In this article, Hall describes how he applies his own individualized evaluation system to teachers with different years of experience.

The beginning teacher needs the most attention. Hall (a high school principal), together with the assistant principal and department chairman, first help the new teacher formulate reasonable long-range objectives. Evaluation during this period centers not on the teacher but on the objectives.

Next one or more of the evaluators observe the teacher in the classroom several times and call him or her in for consultation whenever they feel is necessary. They prepare a written evaluation and present it to the teacher, who is then asked to "write what he feels are his weak and strong points and what he would like us to do" to help him improve.

If the new teacher "has not had a course in individualizing and humanizing instruction in his undergraduate studies," Hall and the assistant principal "orient" the teacher by going through a student's

complete profile with him and delineating what they expect. Since most new teachers have come directly from a college where lecturing was the main teaching method, they "debrief the teacher in order to get him away from this type of teaching."

The final evaluation of a beginning teacher is a conference in which Hall and the teacher compare evaluations of performance. Hall presents the teacher with a written evaluation while stressing improvement as the goal of evaluation.

Since teachers may be granted tenure after three years, Hall believes that the third year is the most crucial period for evaluation. He has a lengthy conference with the teacher at the end of the second year and another conference at the beginning of the third year. He helps the teacher set up objectives and offers recommendations for improvement. During the third year, he observes the teacher several times.

Hall also discusses evaluation of five-year and ten-year teachers, though in less detail.

---

4 **Hickcox, Edward S.,** and **Rooney, Thomas.** *The Shape of Teacher Evaluation: A Survey of Practices in the Capital District of New York.* n.d. 57 pages. ED 120 259

Hickcox and Rooney describe the present state of teacher evaluation and then offer their own alternative approach.

The authors conducted a small survey of evaluation practices in eleven schools that differed widely in size and type (rural, suburban, urban). The picture that emerged is a common one: evaluations were infrequent, particularly for tenured teachers; evaluations were usually done by one person—the principal, using standardized rating forms; and there was rarely a preobservation conference between evaluator and teacher.

The authors believe their alternative model can help overcome some of the problems inherent in current systems of evaluation. In their system, the supervisor and teacher meet prior to a classroom presentation and agree on the objectives of the lesson. They then plan together the classroom procedures that will achieve the objectives. Finally, and most importantly, they agree on what the evaluation criteria will be (student performance, classroom observation ratings, opinions of peers or students).

This approach alters the principal's role in subtle but important ways. Since objectives, procedures, and criteria of evaluation are mutually agreed on, the relationship between principal and teacher approaches that of professional colleagues. The principal's role shifts from "judge" to "guide."

Although this system is both simple and short on paperwork, the authors predict that it may be difficult to implement. They suggest that the principal begin the system with a small group of teachers (a teaching team if possible) and then slowly expand the system if it is a success.

---

5 **Igoe, Joseph A.,** and **DiRocco, Anthony P.** *Teacher Evaluation: Contract Procedures, Contract Clauses, Arbitration Cases. A Handbook for the School Administrator and Evaluator.* Albany: Thealan Associates, Inc., 1977. 129 pages. ED 137 921

This well-written handbook has been designed to provide school administrators, particularly principals, with "a new insight into contract evaluation procedures." Igoe and DiRocco's evaluation of those procedures includes descriptions of a number of actual arbitration cases involving evaluation clauses. The work is replete with useful advice for administrators and school districts.

Most teacher contracts now have a teacher evaluation procedure clause, and most of the clauses have a similar format. First, there is usually a philosophical statement of intent; such as "the purpose of evaluation is the improvement of professional competence." The

trouble with such statements is that their meaning is usually vague; arbitrators can interpret them in any number of ways. The authors suggest that districts "avoid statements of philosophy not only in evaluation but also in other areas of the contract."

The "major pitfall in the evaluation clause is the specified procedures," advise the authors. The specified procedures can include the number of evaluations to be conducted, the dates by which each evaluation must be completed, the length of observation periods, and the conditions for advance notice to teachers. The main point here is that each outlined procedure must be followed *to the letter*. Any infraction, no matter how small, can lead to the reversal of a dismissal. The authors suggest making "the procedures as simple as possible by avoiding the overuse of words," because each new word makes the requirements more difficult to meet.

Many evaluation clauses "require that the evaluator prescribe a program of improvement for the teacher" if there are deficiencies in the teacher's performance. And nearly all clauses "allow the evaluated teacher to sign a copy of the evaluation." Again, the authors' recommendation is to follow the specified procedures exactly and to "never assume anything." Keep detailed records of the evaluations and make sure the teacher knows if he or she is deficient.

The major portions of the book are devoted to "sample procedures from negotiated contracts" from around the country and eighteen accounts of "arbitration cases which have resulted from contract evaluation procedures." Each specific case illustrates an important aspect of administering evaluation clauses and is followed by comments and recommendations from the authors.

---

6 **Kowalski, Joan P. Sullivan.** *Evaluating Teacher Performance. ERS Report.* Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1978. 234 pages. ED number not yet assigned.

This ERS report provides a good characterization of the state of teacher evaluation in the United States today. Included are a brief review of the literature on evaluation, the results of a 1977 survey of the nation's school systems, and extensive examples of evaluation instruments, contract clauses, and other materials pertaining to teacher evaluation that were provided by the 375 school districts responding to the mailed questionnaire used in the survey.

School districts were asked to describe the uses they made of evaluation reports. The most frequent response was "to help teachers improve their teaching performance," but the next five most frequent responses had to do with hiring, firing, promotion, and salary decisions.

About two-thirds of the responding districts indicated that they provided some kind of training for evaluators. The most common

training methods indicated were inservice training, summer workshops, dissemination of handbooks and circulars, and the use of outside consultants.

Sixty percent of the districts "rate teachers against a prescribed checklist of performance standards at some point in the evaluation process," but "evaluation by objectives" methods are also becoming increasingly popular; about 44 percent of the districts now evaluate teachers on stated goals and objectives. Most districts require a postobservation conference between evaluator and teacher, and some also require a preobservation conference to outline goals for the lesson.

The survey also indicated that the principal is primarily responsible for evaluating teachers in most of the schools. This is more often the case in both small schools and elementary schools, while in larger and higher level schools assistant principals, supervisors, and department chairmen become increasingly involved.

In one-third of the districts, teachers are required to periodically evaluate themselves, while 3 percent of the districts reported that peer evaluation takes place in their schools. Student evaluations become part of the teacher's formal evaluation file in 2 percent of the districts, but less than 1 percent of the surveyed districts reported that parents participate in teacher evaluation.

Most of this publication is devoted to specific examples of contract clauses, school board policies, evaluation instruments, state laws regarding evaluation, descriptions of inservice programs, and other material regarding evaluation.

---

7 **Robinson, John J.** "The Observation Report—A Help or a Nuisance?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 62, 416 (March 1978), pp. 22-26. EJ 173 573.

Robinson presents the results of a survey of Connecticut high schools that use written classroom observation reports as part of their evaluation process. The survey's purpose was to find out how the observation reports are used and what value they have as perceived by teachers and supervisors.

The survey found that three-quarters of the state's high schools used written observation reports, but only one-half of the schools required such use. Copies of the report were given to the teacher and in many districts to the superintendent as well, but rarely to the board. Only about half of the teachers were observed twice or more during the year the survey was conducted.

Supervisors felt that the reports were valuable as aids for improving instruction, devices for communication between supervisor and teacher, and records of teacher strengths and weaknesses. Among the limitations that the supervisors perceived were that the reports were "too subjective," were "limited by the writer's competence," and were "useless without a conference."

Most of the observations were, in fact, followed by a postvisitation conference, but "the pre-visitation conference was not widely used." Supervisors "usually did not prepare themselves before observing a class" by reviewing either lesson plans or previous observation reports. The study also revealed that "there are no ongoing inservice training programs for supervisors to improve their observation techniques."

Over three-fourths of the supervisors, however, believed the reports did help improve instruction. One-half of the untenured teachers and one-third of the tenured teachers thought the same.

Robinson offers several suggestions for improving the usefulness of observation reports. (1) Supervisors should "schedule one class period a day for the purpose of observing teachers," so that more observations will be conducted; (2) "School districts should offer inservice courses in observing classes to their supervisors"; (3) Previsitation conferences should become an integral part of the evaluation process.

---

8 **Saif, Philip S.** *A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals.* Bloomfield, Connecticut: Capitol Region Education Council, 1976. 180 pages. ED 133 371.

This handbook was prepared by Saif and teacher committees from three Connecticut school districts to provide model job descriptions and evaluation instruments for all Connecticut school districts. The job descriptions are detailed outlines of the responsibilities of teachers and principals. The evaluation instruments were developed "to match the job descriptions in order to facilitate the assessment of teacher and principal performance."

The teacher evaluation process specifies three conferences between the evaluator and the teacher during the school year. In a preconference at the beginning of the school year the teacher and evaluator agree on the categories of the job description in which deficiencies exist. (The major categories are planning and preparation, classroom management, instruction and interaction, assessment, competencies and professional development, and human relationships.) Improvement in a deficient area becomes a goal or objective for the year.

The evaluator and teacher next agree on the actions the teacher will perform to reach the objectives. Finally, they agree on how they will validate the achievement of an objective. They meet again in mid-year and end-of-year conferences to determine progress toward objectives.

The evaluation instruments in this manual are designed to measure the degree of achievement of the objectives. For each major category of the teacher's job description, there are three to five evaluation instruments. The teacher and evaluator choose one

ORDER COPIES OF NUMBERED ITEMS FROM SOURCES BELOW

DO NOT ORDER FROM THE CLEARINGHOUSE

1. University Microfilms International (UMI), 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Place orders for reprints through toll-free hotline (800) 521-0600 or prepay by cash, check, money order, or credit card. Specify quantity, EJ number, journal title, article title, and volume, issue, and date. $6.00, additional copies of same article $1.00 each.
2. UMI (see No. 1). $6.00.
3. ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210 in (MF) microfiche (up to 96 pages per fiche) or (HC) paper copy reproduction. Payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00. Specify ED 097 338. MF $0.83. HC $1.67. Plus postage.*
4. EDRS (see No. 3). Specify ED 120 259. MF $0.83. HC $3.50. Plus postage.*
5. Copies available from Thealan Associates, Inc., 15 Computer Drive West, Albany, NY 12205. $14.95.
6. Copies available from Educational Research Service, Inc., 1800 N. Kent St., Arlington, VA 22209. $17.50.
7. UMI (see No. 1). $4.00.
8. EDRS (see No. 3). Specify ED 133 371. MF $0.83. HC $10.03. Plus postage.*
9. EDRS (see No. 3). Specify ED 105 637. MF $0.83. HC $2.06. Plus postage.*
10. EDRS (see No. 3). Specify ED 137 928. MF $0.83. HC not available. Plus postage.*

*Postage or United Parcel Service delivery:
1st class: (MF only) 1-3, $0.15; 4-7, $0.28.
4th class: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, $0.48; each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.18; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $0.11 per each additional 75 pages.
UPS: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, not to exceed $1.04; each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.30; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $3.13 to $15.64 per each additional 75 pages.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in Resources in Education (RIE), available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Journal articles are announced in Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $62 a year from Macmillan Information, 100 D Brown Street, Riverside, New Jersey 08075.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, monographs, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of School Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the American Association of School Administrators or the National Institute of Education.

EA 010 981

or more instruments as their measuring "tools" for each deficient area.

The evaluation instruments consist of various forms and questionnaires on which both evaluator and teacher indicate the extent to which they feel the teacher is fulfilling his or her responsibilities in a particular area. Saif provides twenty-six such instruments and encourages teachers and evaluators to create their own variations as needed. Included in this handbook are similar evaluation instruments and a job description for principals.

9 **Thompson, June E.; Dornbusch, Sanford M.;** and **Scott, W. Richard.** *Failures of Communication in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals. Technical Report No. 43.* Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1975. 27 pages. ED 105 637.

Principals may be able to improve both teaching and teacher satisfaction simply by increasing the frequency of evaluation. This is one conclusion of a study conducted to determine the differences in perceptions of principals and teachers regarding various aspects of teacher evaluation. The authors administered questionnaires to thirty-three experienced principals (at least one year in current position) in three districts, and to 131 teachers in one of those districts.

After compiling and analyzing their data, the researchers found that there was little agreement between principals and teachers regarding the extent to which teachers knew what information and criteria were used in evaluation. In other words, principals thought teachers knew more about the evaluation process than they really did. Principals also "reported communicating their evaluations much more frequently than teachers reported receiving them."

Some principals reported that they thought "teachers would be dissatisfied with *frequent* evaluations and therefore would resist them." But the researchers' data point in the other direction—"the frequency of communicating evaluations proved to be a major factor in teacher satisfaction with evaluations." Similarly, the study found that as the frequency of evaluation increased so did teachers' perceptions that the evaluations were helping them improve their teaching.

The authors selected two of the schools they studied for closer examination. The schools differed widely in the frequency of evaluations, a difference that was reflected in the widely differing levels of teacher satisfaction. Thirteen tables illustrate the authors' findings.

10 **Tuckman, Bruce W.; Steber, James, M.;** and **Hyman, Ronald T.** "Teacher Behavior Is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Perceptions of Principals." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, April 1977. 18 pages. ED 137 928.

Do principals at different grade levels have different ideas about what makes an effective teacher? To answer this question, the authors asked thirty principals (ten each at the senior high, intermediate, and elementary levels) to characterize ten of their teachers' styles using the Tuckman Teacher Feedback Form (TTFF), and then to rate each teacher's overall effectiveness on a nine-point scale.

In addition, the three hundred teachers were asked to characterize their own styles using the TTFF, which measures perceptions of four components of teaching style: "creativity, dynamism (dominance plus energy), organized demeanor (organization plus control), and warmth and acceptance."

The study revealed that principals at the three levels perceived both "dynamism" and "warmth and acceptance" differently. Teachers rated "most effective" at the elementary level were rated lowest by their principals for dynamism and highest for warmth and acceptance. In contrast, "both intermediate and senior high principals perceived dynamism as positively related to teaching effectiveness," while senior high principals perceived warmth and acceptance as being negatively related to effectiveness.

The study also found that "teachers rated by their principals as 'least effective' " rated themselves "as high on all four TTFF dimensions as teachers rated by their principals as 'most effective'." Obviously, then, the least effective teachers "do not perceive themselves as ineffective."

The authors note that the discrepancies between principal and teacher ratings are greatest for the "least effective" teachers at the senior high level. The authors suggest that the larger communications gap at the senior level may be due to the larger and more complex structure of most senior high schools, which tends to insulate teachers and principals from each other.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403